

The Hartford Seminary Foundation

The Hartford Theological Seminary
The Hartford School of Religious Education
The Kennedy School of Missions

BULLETIN



NUMBER 1

JUNE, 1946

DUNCAN BLACK MACDONALD

THIS is a brief note to introduce Duncan Black Macdonald to the new generations of students at the Hartford Seminary Foundation.

Dr. Macdonald had a majestic, not a pedantic, mind. It reigned over the literature of three religions. In the accompanying sketch he has traced the growth and fruition of his mental powers and given to us the open secret of his ascent to success as a scholar and teacher. He worked, not as little, but as thoroughly, as he could.

In *The Moslem World* for January, 1944, there is an account of Dr. Macdonald's life as teacher, scholar, and author. His students, colleagues, and friends will appreciate this autobiography of his mind, brief though it is. They will be glad to know that his name is still remembered in the world of Orientalists. Recently a request came from Hungary, asking him for an article to appear in a projected Memorial Volume, to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the death of his friend, Ignaz Goldziher. It is gratifying that Dr. Macdonald's works and standards of scholarship are still honored. Increasingly new publications are quoting the books and articles he wrote and also those written by his students, including the articles which appeared in the *Macdonald Presentation Volume*, published in 1933, ten years before he died.

The Archive Department of the Hartford Seminary Foundation will be glad to receive copies of letters written by Dr. Macdonald to any of his correspondents.

EDWIN E. CALVERLEY

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

DUNCAN BLACK MACDONALD

THIS is an attempt to set down briefly what I seem, to myself now in my 75th year, to have done in my life. This statement is, of necessity, very egoistic and studded with I's, but that cannot be helped. It is all about myself. If I can finish my third Old Testament book on the Hebrew religious genius that will probably be the end.

First, then, I went to the University of Glasgow, in November, 1880, with about the worst possible preparation. My only asset was that I had read widely in English literature and could write, but very slowly, good English. Of Latin, Greek, mathematics, history, philosophy, I had very little. I discovered my weakness at once and took the second year over again in Latin and Greek. The year was not wasted. I learned to write fair Latin prose and to read ordinary Latin at sight. My Greek remained weak, but both in Latin and Greek I gained a wide range of literary knowledge. This has stood me in good stead in my later writings on the Old Testament. But I did not really learn Greek—the language—until I set to work on it in later life, applying to it the experience I had gained in learning other languages. That is, I had discovered that the tables of verbs and nouns must be learned absolutely and that diligent practice in the writing of the language must be added to wide reading. To this discovery I ascribe whatever success I have had as a teacher of languages. Emphatically I am not a linguist, but I have had to learn a certain amount of a number of languages and so I can enter into the difficulties of students. *That*, the born linguist can seldom do, and so he is seldom a good teacher of language.

My experience in philosophy at the University was peculiar. From my earliest childhood I know that I was observing my own psychological processes, but of metaphysics—except theological—I had no idea. In my first

philosophical year in the Class of Logic with Veitch I made a complete failure—probably a fourth class. The next year with Edward Caird, in what was called “moral philosophy,” really general philosophy, I was always in the first class in the examination and regularly in the second in the Exercises. When Caird himself read my Exercise, he always gave me II B; the assistant always gave me II A. I did not attempt the essays. Veitch had scared me too thoroughly. In the final results I was first outside of the prize list. I did not go further with philosophy but I was now, in it, fairly on my feet. In the English literature class, under John Nichol, I was entirely on my feet. It was the subject to which all the preparation of my life had gone and I gained the first class-prize. I suppose that with Nichol for the first time I stood out clear from the rest of the class. With my other teachers I was just one of the students. In mathematics and what was called natural philosophy I got through with a very much enlarged horizon. The physics was, of course, the old-fashioned atomism and materialistic certainty. In a very few years all that was to explode into the new physics of the Roentgen rays and the Crookes tube. I came first before the change. I took the senior class in mathematics—Calculus, Geometrical Cones, Analytical Geometry, and Quaternions, while my horizon was again greatly enlarged. I learned that I was not a mathematician, but I did get a mystical feeling as to an infinite world beyond that was not material. That has remained with me.

Let me throw in here that the broad influence upon us students of being in daily contact with such first-class men as Jebb, Kelvin, Edward Caird, and John Nichol was and must have been enormous. We knew very well the difference between them and their assistants.

I know that I entered the Divinity Hall with the reputation of a very wide reader and an eccentric student. In passing elementary examinations I was no good at all, but I had ranged widely and I had ideas. In the entrance exam-

ination by the Presbytery of Glasgow I took the first prize, but was admonished that I was *not* first in *Shorter Catechism*. That was intelligible, for I had got it up in a week. I was also admonished that some members of the Presbytery smelt heresy in my papers. I replied that I was beginning my theological studies and was willing to be taught, an attitude which, I think, I have always kept. I fear I was *not* taught except by James Robertson, the professor of Hebrew. I never really learned theology until I had to learn that of Islâm. To work out the Articles of Belief of Nasafî was a more thorough theological training than was given then in the University of Glasgow. With the Presbytery of Glasgow I was first again in the second year examination and, then second in the third year examination. A student had changed over from another Presbytery who understood the art of such examinations better than I did. But the Presbytery found they had money enough for a second prize for me. With the same student I divided the Cooke-Macfarlane, the leaving prize of the Divinity Hall. In the final examination for license my papers were the only ones commended. I give these details to show the change that had come to me in those eight years of college. If there had been an entrance examination, I could never have got in. So I have a deep prejudice against such things.

But with James Robertson my future life and work were fixed. Yet, again, in the same way, I did not take the first prize in either of the Hebrew classes—my knowledge was not of that kind. I was second, I think, in both. But I took a University Essay prize and the Findlater Scholarship for the first part of the B.D. examination. A year after graduation the Black Fellowship fell vacant and I took it. I trust that my reiterating “I took” will be pardoned. It is literal. I “took” these things with my bow and spear against competitors. There was no nonsense of “awarding.” I had taken elementary Arabic and Syriac with Robertson and had read widely in Arabic with myself. Fortunately, the

Ajurrûmiya was in my reading. When I went on my fellowship to Sachau in Berlin he asked me if I had read it. That I had, opened to me his most advanced courses. In Berlin I took all the Arabic I could get and also Syriac and Ethiopic. I found that the Hebrew courses had nothing new for me, that is from philosophical and literary points of view. It was all criticism and analysis, conservative and radical.

In my last years in Glasgow I had become interested in the problem of the early translations of the Bible into Arabic and especially of the Gospels. I had worked in a confused way at the Arabic *Diatessaron* and at the quotations in early Christian Arabic, but got nowhere. Then I did cataloguing work in the Library of the Hunterian Museum of the University of Glasgow—a very important part of my bibliographical training—and I found there an Arabic MS. of the four Gospels with the usual Arabic introduction to each. I worked carefully at that and compared it with the other old texts, the Polyglots, Lagarde, etc., and even sent some of my results to Lagarde. This was my first independent approach to the world of scholars. But among the different texts all was confusion and, in reality, I could see no light or order. In the same library I found a good MS. of the *Mulhat al-i'râb* of Harîrî and copied a great part of it. I have the copy still but I have done nothing with it. But it was a good experience.

Then I was called to Hartford and in the summer of 1892, at the suggestion of Dr. Hartranft, I spent some time in London studying Egyptology under F. L. Griffith, then in the British Museum. At the British Museum I had already examined in 1890, on my way to Germany to study under my fellowship, a number of Arabic MSS. of the Gospels and one especially with a long historical introduction which, apparently, had never before been noticed, certainly not examined. It gave an account, evidently from full knowledge of the different Arabic translations in existence, deriving from Greek, Syriac, and Coptic, describing

each with its author, and then constructed a composite text with elaborate references to the different languages. That introduction I copied and I printed it partially with a translation in the *Hartford Seminary Record*, and much more completely in the *Homenaje* to the Spanish scholar, Codera.

This was my first discovery and real contribution to learning. I had "let light into a dark place," as James Robertson said; Crum, too, the Coptic scholar, received it in the same way. But the practical result was to show that *Arabs* might as well be dropped from the critical apparatus of the New Testament. I do not think that the investigation has been pushed further, but I have dealt with the learned Coptic family which produced this composite text in an article in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. They have been studied also by the Jesuits in Beirout.

I spent another summer in Egyptology with Erman in Berlin, tutored by Breasted. In Hartford I taught, I think, one Coptic class, but that was the end of it. I could not carry Egyptology further with the burden of the rest of my work in Hartford. That work had opened out widely in two directions which have remained my special job for the rest of my life. One was Arabic, and the literature, life, theology and philosophy of Islam—the whole civilization of the Muslim world—and the other was Hebrew and the similar Hebrew world. I put the languages first and stressed them; I was gradually learning these, year by year, as I went along. This was the attitude that James Robertson had fostered in me—ability first of all to read, understand, and appreciate the original texts rather than devotion to the critical and too often evanescent theories about them. Thus in my fellowship examination on paper was a page of sight Arabic to be turned into Hebrew and another was to write in Hebrew an account of the Flight into Egypt. There were also, of course, general papers, but the stress was on the language basis.

From 1892 until 1903, when my *Development* appeared, were great years of work, gathering and reading Arabic texts and steeping myself in the whole civilization of Islam. This work, apart from my steady turning of the Hebrew teaching wheel—I spent twenty years teaching elementary Hebrew and about forty reading Hebrew texts in class—could be divided as follows: (1) work necessary to write the *Development*. That involved wide reading of theological texts, as the translated appendices will show. It was all first-hand work and laid the foundations of my knowledge of Islam. It gave, too, an outline into which I could fit that knowledge as it gradually grew. (2) Al-Ghazzâlî. I really came to him through Hebrew. The Song of Songs had always puzzled me, both literally as a collection of love and marriage songs, and theologically in its interpretation as a song of divine love. In my student days I had studied the book very carefully and even constructed a separate concordance and lexicon to it. Then I had found in Lane's *Modern Egyptians* a suggestion that this development was parallel to the use by Sûfis of love songs as hymns. Next in von Kremer's *Herrschenden Ideen* I found much more on the Sûfis and their songs and especially on account of al-Ghazzâlî and a reference to his treatise in the *Ihyâ* on religious ecstasy on listening to music and singing. I translated that treatise and it appeared in *JRAS* (April-Oct., 1901). A life of al-Ghazzâlî appeared in *JAOS* (Vol. XX). By this time and for this purpose I had procured the great edition of the *Ihyâ* with the commentary of the Sayyid Mur-tada. In it and in other Sûfî literature I read widely and the further study of the Song of Songs was dropped. Quite recently I have been brought back to it by a group of Muslim traditions on the psychological condition of the prophet in prophecy. That has still to be worked out and the link of connection found. It is not in the Targums. I hope to deal with it in my *Hebrew Religious Genius*. But at that time Sûfî mysticism no longer needed an introduction and al-

Ghazzâlî stood on his own feet. My *Life of al-Ghazzâlî* may be said to have marked an epoch and the great Arabists of Europe recognized that. As Goldziher told me afterwards, De Goeje thought very highly of it. After it, appeared Asín's work on al-Ghazzâlî and still later that of Carra de Vaux. The time was ripe for a renewed study of the great mystics of Islam. This was the beginning, too, of my long friendship with Asín. He introduced himself, writing post-cards in Latin. With this, too, connect much later my Haskell lectures at the University of Chicago (1906) published in 1909 as *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam*. It was a follower at a great distance and with many deep differences of William James's *Varieties of Religious Experience*. William James liked it.

In those eleven golden years came (3) my work on the text of the *Arabian Nights*. Through the generosity of Professor Jewett of Harvard, I was furnished with rotographs of the Galland MS. of the *Nights* at Paris and of its sister MS. in the Vatican Library. My object was an edition of the Galland text and I had about half of it transcribed and ready for the printer when my strength failed and I had to pass it over for completion to my former pupil, William Thomson, now of Harvard. That was much later and through many years a great part of my time and strength was given to articles on the history of the *Nights*. Carrying on the work of Zotenberg and of von Hammer, I think I have fairly established that history. It is given in outline with the references in my article on the *Nights* in the first part of the Supplement to the Leyden *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. I need not rehearse these articles here. But in this connection should be mentioned my discovery in the Bodleian of an Arabic MS. of *Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves*, the only oriental text so far found. I printed it in *JRAS* and in a later number of the same Galland's own sketch of the story in his MS. Journal. Very much later I drew up a very elaborate bibliography of the early editions of Galland

in French and in English and of some cognate books. This was based on my own very wide collection of Galland, including a first edition, and was printed in the *Journal of the Graduate Library School* of the University of Chicago. Thus we have the story now in three forms: this Arabic text, Galland's French translation of the same Arabic text, and Galland's abstract from memory in his *Journal*.

In these same years came (4) the first idea and beginning of my study of the peculiar genius of the Hebrews. In 1893 the idea struck me of giving a course of lectures on their literary genius. I remember still when and how the first flash of the idea came. It was on a railway journey by night through Holland to the Hook of Holland. That course was at first quite short but gradually expanded until it was my principal Hebrew course and one taken by practically all students. In 1933 it appeared as a book, *The Hebrew Literary Genius*. Of much later origin was the second volume of my Old Testament studies, *The Hebrew Philosophical Genius*, in 1936. The third volume, *The Hebrew Religious Genius* is at present (August, 1937) only half written. With it, I suspect, my Old Testament work will be done and perhaps all my work. I am writing these words in my study in the Cottage at Pemaquid Point which my wife and I built in 1898, the year we were married. I write now at the same old study table which had belonged to her grandfather. With this Cottage and with the presence and memory of my wife are connected at least the beginnings of all my most important work. In these years, too, but when exactly I cannot fix, I first glimpsed my understanding of the Book of Ecclesiastes and Job. On Job I published two articles in *Journals* and the gist of my understanding of Ecclesiastes is in an emendation in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

In 1907-8 came my year of leave of absence and of travel in the East—Egypt, Syria, Turkey. One of the results of this was my *Aspects of Islam*, delivered first as

public lectures before the Hartford Seminary and later made into a book. It was well received by those who knew Islam. Lord Cramer wrote to me that it described the Egypt he knew better than any other book. Stanley Lane-Poole reviewed it in the same sense and Artin Pasha was tickled by the way I had used information gained from him. It, with my other two books on Islam, is now out of print. About that time groups also much work, especially on encyclopaedias. I wrote a number of semi-popular articles for the new edition (that of the University of Cambridge) of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. With the abbreviated last edition I had nothing to do, except to write the article in it on the *Arabian Nights*. I did that because I feared what might happen with the editors as they were. I began a short connection with Hasting's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. Most important of all I began, with the very first part, to contribute to the Leyden *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. For that I wrote a great many articles, closing with one on the *Arabian Nights* in the first Part of the Supplement. In those articles, I am certain, is my most advanced and original work on Islam, with the exception of my separate articles on *Wahm* and on *Rûh* and on the history of the *Nights*—also that on recreation in Adam's time, the first full and exact statement of that conception.

In these same fruitful years in the 1890's I began to review in the *New York Nation*. I wrote articles, also, for it, "On translating the *Arabian Nights*," "On translating the Old Testament" and on phases of contemporary oriental history. When the *Nation* went Bolshy, I wrote in *The Review*, but in time I had to drop such work because of pressure of other work. This journalistic part of my life was of the greatest importance for my own development and also for my standing among the scholars of this country. I came to be known even behind the anonymity of the *Nation*. In those years, also, came another useful experience when I acted as "devil" for Paul Haupt on his *Polychrome Bible*.

The translations and notes for several volumes had been made by foreign scholars and then translated into English by some of Haupt's young men. He was justly suspicious of their English and my job was to correct it and generally sub-edit. This ultimately brought me into contact with Horace Howard Furness and I had a valuable correspondence with him, then and later. His letters to me are now in the Watkinson Library.

Other relationships which were of the highest value to me were with older Arabists. In this country there was practically no one, in those early days at least, who was working on the same lines and with the same methods as myself. So my intercourse had to be with Arabists in Europe. I have already mentioned James Robertson and Sachau. Very early I got into contact with Goldziher and Nöldeke and with the greatest profit to myself. I hit upon a plan of introducing myself. When I had written an article which I thought of any importance I would send copies of it to those who might be interested, especially if they had already written on that subject. So I sent a copy of my *Life of al-Ghazzâlî* to, amongst others, Goldziher. The result was most happy for me. We became firm friends and were, on Goldziher's invitation, on terms of "*Du und Du*." As he told my wife, when he visited us in Hartford, on the occasion of the St. Louis Congress of Arts and Science, he regarded me as his natural successor in Muslim Theology. Years before, in Berlin, when I was with Sachau, he had suggested to me that I should give myself to that branch of Arabic studies. He thought I was more of a theologian than I really was at that time. Now Goldziher pressed on me the same thing. But that could not be. My position in the Seminary compelled me to give time and strength to too many other subjects. There was, however, besides that the advantage that all the subjects I had to work at fertilized one another. I could not, for example, have written my *Hebrew Literary Genius* without the background of broad literature which

I drew from John Nichol and, perhaps still more the Arabic background which was half of my life. *The Arabian Nights* and the Old Testament come together. I do not remember with what articles I scraped acquaintance with Nöldeke, but that came early and if not so intimate as with Goldziher was a friendship of equal value. In a sense the Atlantic was a barrier between me and the world of Arabists but even that had its compensations. I was clear of all the feuds among European Arabists. I was a pupil of Sachau and yet on intimate terms with Nöldeke and Snouck Hurgronje. That would hardly have been possible had I been in Europe. Feuds need conversations and personal contacts to survive.

I have said nothing of the part of my life which went into class teaching either on the side of the Old Testament or of Islam. I had many classes and my lecture courses were always well taken. Sometimes I taught as many as 20 hours a week and over. Those students who might be claimed by me as peculiarly my own have had varied and distinguished careers. They have filled college and university chairs and done good work in foreign missions and in home pulpits. At present I can think only of one who has not remained on intimate and friendly terms with me. But that whole question of the ultimate results of my life as a teacher can be adequately answered only by my pupils themselves. There was a partial answer to it in the *Presentation Volume* on my seventieth birthday. The final answer can come only when I am gone.

A great part of my life has been given to correspondence. I found from the first that I expressed myself easily in letters and this was fortunate from two points of view. Isolated as I was in America, my intercourse with fellow Arabists had to be by letter and I was fortunate to enter into relations with many good correspondents. On another side I have always tried to keep contact with my students, and especially the more promising students after their graduation. I used to say to them that I took the oriental

attitude as to the relation of teacher and pupil which regards that relation as life-long; that I hoped they would keep in touch with me and that they would turn to me frankly with any difficulties or problems they might meet, especially in their life as students; that I would try to answer these questions to the best of my knowledge and ability. Some of them did; many of them did not. But those who did were my best students and a considerable part of my time was given to meeting their questions and needs.

In the above no attempt has been made at bibliographical fullness or exactness; that must be sought elsewhere. This is a broad picture of my working life as I see it now. And the picture would be utterly incomplete and out of drawing if it did not take in my wife. From the very beginning she set herself, in her own words, "to be a scholar's wife." She knew my possibilities—I can say that now, she being dead—before any one else and gave herself utterly to fulfill them. We were not so fortunate as to have children and so the world of our home was the two of us; in that our lives were linked of the closest. My wife knew about all my work, followed it and understood it. She learned enough of Arabic for that purpose and typed and criticized all my writing. As I wrote upstairs at this table I could hear her typing it out on the typewriter in the room below. From time to time her voice would come up when she thought I was writing slovenly English. Now, as I write, there are no such sounds and I have no one to tell me "You can't say that!" The walls of this Cottage must be saturated with psychic impressions from those days but they cannot pierce to me. I have not that gift, but she had. When we were staying at Highland Court and I came back from the St. Louis Congress she showed me sheets of paper covered with scrawly writing. I had said once that I should like to see and be in intimate contact with automatic writing and she had begun to experiment with herself. This is only one instance of her constant helpfulness to me in my work. And

this came to be of the highest importance in giving a basis of reality to my studies in Muslim magic and in esoteric phenomena generally. We kept up our experiments and reached some interesting and quite certain results, but neither of us came to the spiritist position. We got no evidence at all of action on the part of departed spirits and my wife's final position was that the writing personality was her dream self. The evidence for that was good and I agreed with her.

So, if I had gone first, I think it very probable that something purporting to be me would have appeared in my wife's automatic writing. She would also have been "sensitive" to the psychic loading with impressions of the walls and rooms in which we had lived together. Whether that would have been for good or bad I do not know. I am sure that she would have maintained her steady and critical common sense, and certainly her life need not, with these possibilities, have been as lonely as mine now is.

These experiences formed so large a part of my life and clarified so greatly my study and writing in Muslim esoterics that I have thought it right to add this statement here. For Hartmann in his partial translation of the *Risâla* of al-Qushairî said it was my *grosser Verdienst* that I had brought out the reality of those phenomena at least for al-Ghazzâlî himself and his fellow Sûfîs. Certainly my work on al-Ghazzâlî and my clearing up of the history of the *Arabian Nights* seem to me now my principal contribution to our knowledge of Islam. And now my three books on the Hebrew genius are certainly my contribution to our knowledge of the Old Testament and the people who produced it. And so the End. And I can go with an easy mind to meet my wife. She knows I have done what I could. She promised Goldziher to keep me at work. So she did and so she still does with her memories and influence.

Let me try to sum up still more broadly. Again and again in my life it has come to me that in all my work there

was a bridge-building element. I tried to understand this thing and that thing—often far apart—and then to see their relationship and bring them together. Even when I was very young, my family in jest used to speak of my “free-coup” of knowledge. I struggled against limitation to specialization and sought wide-embracing views. I sought to be thorough in my knowledge of each thing but I refused to be bound to any one thing. So it came about that I, a theologian and Semitist, a student of philosophy and literature, was one of the original founders of the Society for the History of Science and am still one of the editors of *Isis*, its organ. Even my preferred subject, the Hebrews and the Muslims, covers an immense field and requires and takes in practically all knowledge. Of course, I could not cover it, but I did my best and always protested against those who confined themselves to one little corner. I had found that each part illumined every other part and that there was such a thing as a cross-fertilization in thought. This holds, I know, of all intellectual disciplines; nothing lives to itself alone. One of my dreams has been to bring home to European medievalists that these subjects of necessity include medieval Islam—that the civilization surrounding the Mediterranean in medieval times was one.

And I tried to do the same thing on the spiritual side. I was eager to enter into and to understand and to make understandable the genius of all the different phases of the Christian faith. They had all their real and catholic sides for me, and I wished them to meet in those truly catholic aspects. And beyond the Christian faith I wished myself to understand and make intelligible to others the great faiths of the world. When I studied and taught the theology of Islam it was to make it clear and even persuasive to others. Human minds and hearts have believed this—let us see why and how that was. So I put it to my students. When Temple Gairdner came to me to study Islam he came seeking knock-down arguments against Muslims. I never gave

him such but he went away understanding the genius of Islam and able to enter into the minds of Muslims. He had passed from controversy to persuasion. In this conversion of his my wife had a large part. It is a very singular fact, but it is true, that when I began my work, there were very few missionaries who knew that the Muslims had any theological literature at all. It began and ended for them with the Koran. Some had heard vaguely of the Traditions. When they came to me they demanded Koran and, perhaps, Traditions.

I have tried to do the same thing with regard to the thinking and the faith, or faiths, of the Old Testament Hebrews—what this peculiar genius was, in literature, in philosophy, in religion. On the one hand, I sought to see them apart from the Christian development; on the other, to see them moving towards it. Again, to see them as one of the great, original miracles of God in the world, as unique a miracle as that of the Greek classical civilization and one of much greater importance to the world. It is very hard to get English theologians to see this. They have been soaked in Greek from the beginning of their education and come to Hebrew later in life. In consequence, Plato occupies their minds more than any Hebrew thinker; with him they feel that human thinking began or, at least that it was his thought that became dominant in this world. They cannot realize that the Hebrews had had their thoughts, that these have become dominant in the world and are of true Hebrew origin even though they sometimes agree with the later thinking of Plato. They agree with it; they do not echo it. My Old Testament books are devoted to making this clear. Scottish theologians are not so limited in this way as those of England. This is partly because they have not been so drilled in Greek; Plato does not mean everything to them. But it is partly also because of the devotion to Hebrew studies in Scotland. Every Scottish clergyman must have some, however slight, knowledge of Hebrew. He

may make haste to forget it, but it has been part of his prescribed training. It is not prescribed for the English clergy and comparatively few of them know anything of it. This holds, also, of their theological scholars; Jowett, for example, knew no Hebrew and so laid himself open to Tennyson's rebuke: "You, a priest of the Church, cannot read your own sacred books!" Jowett preferred to read Plato. With this has gone far too great respect for the LXX.

I will try now to put down for eyes that possibly may read this after mine are closed some of the things which I might have done and did not do.

A young man's first sermon marks one of the epochs of his life. I had been asked to preach—the first time—and I must write a sermon for it. I had never made any attempt at that kind of thing; I had never even been a speaker at religious meetings, although I had taught long years in Sunday School. I was naturally tongue-fast and found it hard to express myself. Yet on the subject of literature, I had learned, painfully and slowly, to write. Now I must write a full sermon, something on a religious subject, to be addressed to a congregation and which would take half-an-hour to deliver. The sermon was written, how I do not know. It must have been done very slowly and with great pains. I really know nothing about it now; this, as I write in 1937, was well over fifty years ago, and that sermon has long ceased to exist. But I read it to my mother and she said, "I am quite satisfied"—that and nothing more. I still remember the exact words. I had been given to the ministry of the Word and was being trained for that ministry and she saw a good end to her hopes. I would be a preacher. The ministry of the Church of Scotland is a preaching ministry; I was licensed by that Church "to preach the Gospel" and the motto of my own City of Glasgow is "May Glasgow flourish by the preaching of the Word."

Why have I not continued thus, from a pulpit, in the public worship of God, to preach the Word? I know now

that, beyond my mother's being satisfied with my first sermon, I was on my way to be a preacher, perhaps, with time and opportunity, a great preacher. Certainly I would not have been a mediocre turner-out of two sermons a week. That instinct of impassioned, direct address was in me which makes the difference between the essay, the lecture, and the sermon. It developed even in my class-room lectures and one of my students once remarked to me that my lecturing became, from time to time, preaching. I remember, too, once seeing President Mackenzie, who had come into my class-room, lean forward in his seat and follow what I was saying with the rapt attention of the listener to a sermon. When I was delivering the Haskell Lectures to the Seminary he went farther and said, "I must get you preaching." I replied that that was impossible, for I had not the strength and vitality for it, joined with my class-room teaching. In this country I have preached only once, in the Presbyterian Church in Hartford, and that sermon was printed almost entire in the *Hartford Times*. It was my best popular sermon and had been marked with approval by the examining committee for license of the Glasgow Presbytery. Since then I have never, formally, preached again.

Why was this? I think there were two stages: first the turning from the preaching ministry to the teaching ministry. I did that when I followed the call to Hartford. It gave me the opportunity towards which I had always looked: to be a student and a teacher, to learn, to know, and to pass on knowledge. I had had very little pastoral experience. I was never ordained in Scotland to a charge of my own and the Hartford Seminary did not require or seek that I should be ordained to my charge there, as would have been necessary in Scotland. Almost all the professors in the Hartford Seminary were ordained, but that was because they had already held pastoral charges. In Scotland I knew the pastoral life, for I had been twice, for short periods, an assistant. But in that I had never felt at ease; it did not

attract me as preaching certainly did. I had felt the curious emotional thrill that lies in catching and holding the attention of a great audience in matters of the spirit. When I went to Hartford I saw no reason, so far as I can remember, why I should not continue to preach. My colleagues in the Seminary all preached from time to time.

But very soon I was driven to recognize the second stage in my abandoning of preaching. So heavy a burden of teaching came to me, partly imposed by the Seminary and partly by myself, that I had no vitality left to put into Sunday work. Of necessity I had to keep one day of rest. I have said that part of my teaching was imposed upon me by myself. In teaching I found myself at home as I had not found myself in pastoral work. I discovered that I could teach and the students discovered it also. They took my classes even on out-of-the-way subjects. In consequence, Hartford came to be known as a centre of oriental and especially Arabic study. Long before the School of Missions came into being, I was carrying on a school for the training of missionaries to Muslims in my class-room. That gave me an opportunity to do advanced Arabic teaching; I read in class Arabic theological texts and lectured on Muslim theology. For example, Gairdner of Cairo, when he came to me, did not study in the School of Missions, which did not yet exist. He came to Hartford to study with me. That is one outstanding example, but there were many. The School of Missions, on the Muslim side, had its origin in my class-room. I had come to Hartford determined to have a school of Arabic, although I was warned that there was no opening for Arabic in America. I found the way through Missions. I am bound to add that Dr. Hartranft's wide and scholarly ambitions for the Seminary were of the greatest help. He stood by me and let me go my way.

So it came about that I had definitely and entirely given up preaching. James Robertson warned me against giving it up. "You will do yourself good even if you don't do any

good to any one else," he wrote to me. But it was impossible; I could not stand the strain. And I could not pick and choose which invitation to accept. That would have led to friction and misunderstandings. That cut had to be complete and I had a good reason to give for it. I am glad to remember that President Hartranft saw the situation and never objected to my dropping Sunday duty. Others of the Hartford faculty did not like it. In those early days I was a strange and disconcerting bird to the average New England parson. I know that Dr. Hartranft had to tell them frankly that there were other types of piety besides the New England one.

Another thing from which I definitely turned away was English literature. When I took my First with John Nichol it rather went to my head. It was my first success and I was tempted to go on along that road. It would have meant putting behind me an ecclesiastical future and Arabic as well and might have landed me in journalism or as English Master in some High School. Fortunately, I steadied myself and went on. I see now still more clearly how foolish it would have been to do otherwise. I have no *creative* ability. I could never come out of the crowd by writing a good novel, still less a poem. I cannot write verse; that I knew then as now. I could only have been a hack writer, perhaps an essayist or critic. It is true that I could write good English prose with style in it, but that could be useful in my career.

I cannot say that I myself turned away from the Greek and Latin classics. It was rather that my early education was so unhappy that I could never have made up these early deficiencies. I did make up enough to be of great use to me in my later teaching and writing. I have the reputation through that of being a "humanist"; I could never have become a classical "scholar." If I had been put through the regular High School training in classics, I can see now that

I would have taken honours in classics at the University and landed myself as Classical Master in some school or other. A fortunate escape!

NEW APPOINTMENTS

RUTH SANGER CONANT

MISS RUTH SANGER CONANT was appointed Associate Professor of Religious Education on January 16, 1946.

Miss Conant received the degree of Bachelor of Pedagogy from the Hartford School of Religious Education in 1917, with a Major in Bible. After graduataing, she became Religious Education Secretary of the Y.W.C.A. of Toronto, 1917-1918, and held a similar position in the Pittsburgh Y.W.C.A. 1918-1920. In 1920-1922 she was Student Secretary, Southwestern Field Y.W.C.A., with headquarters in Dallas, Texas.

Miss Conant received the B.A. degree from the University of California, Berkeley, California, in 1924, with a Major in History. Teachers College, Columbia University, conferred upon her the degree of Master of Arts in 1926 in Religious Education. She spent the year from 1926 to 1927 at the Graduate School of Columbia University studying English Literature and Composition and in 1928 was awarded the degree of Bachelor of Divinity at Union Theological Seminary, her Major being Greek New Testament. In 1928-1931 Miss Conant was an instructor in Rhetoric and Composition at Wellesley College. She was ordained to the Christian Ministry in Philadelphia in 1934 and did editorial work for the Beacon Press the next year. She became Minister of Religious Education at Center Church, Hartford, in 1936 and filled that position for the next seven years. At present she is a student in the Divinity School of Yale University and has completed most of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, in the field of Theology.

Miss Conant is a valuable addition to the staff of the School of Religious Education. She takes up her teaching

in September, 1946. Her teaching will be primarily in the field of the more philosophical aspects of religious education.

HOMER HASENPFLUG DUBS

THE REV. HOMER HASENPFLUG DUBS has been Professor of Chinese Studies in the Kennedy School of Missions since July, 1945.

Professor Dubs holds degrees from Yale University (B.A., 1914—third scholar in class), Columbia University (M.A., 1916), Union Theological Seminary (B.D., 1917, *magna cum laude*), and the University of Chicago (Ph.D., 1925, *cum laude*). He is a member of the Western North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Church, and served 1918-24 as a missionary in Hunan, China. He has been an Instructor in Philosophy in the University of Minnesota (1925-27), Professor of Philosophy in Marshall College (1927-34), Director of the Translation of Chinese Historical Project of the American Council of Learned Societies (1934-37), Acting Professor of Philosophy in Duke University (1937-43), Co-Editor of the Chinese History Project, American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations (1943-44); Lecturer in Chinese (1943-44) and Visiting Professor of Chinese (1944-45) in Columbia University.

His printed works include, besides many papers in academic journals, the following books:

The History of the Former Han Dynasty, by Pan Ku. Critical translation with annotations. Vol. I, 1938 (Baltimore); Vol. II, 1944; Vol. III, in press; two more volumes in preparation.

Rational Induction: an Analysis of the Method of Philosophy and Science (Chicago), 1930.

The Works of Hsüntze, trans. from the Chinese (London), 1938.

Hsüntze, the Moulder of Ancient Confucianism (London), 1927.

Evangelical Missions (with B. K. Niebel), 1919.

In Professor Dubs the Foundation feels that it has found a worthy successor to the chair long honored by the distinguished incumbency of Professor Hodous.

ROBERT THOMAS PARSONS

THE REV. ROBERT THOMAS PARSONS has been appointed Professor in the Africa Department of the Kennedy School of Missions from July 1, 1946.

Professor Parsons is a graduate of Indiana Central College (B.A., 1926), Bonebrake Theological Seminary (B.D., 1929), and Cornell University (M.A., 1937). He received the degree of Ph.D. from the Hartford Seminary Foundation in 1940, the subject of his thesis being "The Function of Religion in an African Society."

He served for a number of years in Africa as a missionary of the United Brethren in Christ. He worked among the Kono tribe in Sierra Leone, and later as a teacher in a Union College at Bunumbu.

He comes to us directly from the Michigan Council of Churches, where he has been in charge of interracial work.

PROFESSOR MACDIARMID RETIRES

THE REV. PETER A. MACDIARMID, B.A. (McMaster University, 1903), B.D. (Rochester Theological Seminary, 1906), is retiring at this time after serving as Visiting Professor in the Africa Department of the Kennedy School of Missions since 1944. He was persuaded to join our staff on a temporary basis at that time, to take over the work of Professor Newell S. Booth, who left us to become the Methodist Bishop in Africa.

Professor MacDiarmid served as an evangelistic and educational missionary of the Northern Baptist Board in the Belgian Congo for thirty-seven years. He and his wife returned to this country in 1943. They have had wide ex-

experience in linguistic and instructional fields. No happier arrangement than their coming to us could have been made, from the point of view of the Foundation.

As Professor MacDiarmid enters belatedly now upon his well earned retirement, he bears with him the gratitude of all his colleagues and students for distinguished services rendered, and their warm personal affection.

THE NEW DEAN

PROFESSOR GEORGE ROSS WELLS was appointed Dean of the Hartford School of Religious Education on January 16, 1946.

Dean Wells has been Professor of Psychology at Hartford since 1920. Previously he had been Instructor (1912-13) and Associate Professor (1913-17) of Psychology in Oberlin College and Professor of Psychology in Ohio Wesleyan University (1917-20).

He holds the degrees of B.A. (1906) from McMaster University, M.A. (1909) from Harvard University, and Ph.D. (1912) from Johns Hopkins University. He is the author of the following books:

Influence of Stimulus Duration on Reaction Time
(1913)

Youth and the Open Door (1922)

Individuality and Social Restraint (1929)

The Art of Being a Person (1939)

He has been a member of the Board of Education of the City of Hartford since 1939, and for some years served as its President. He is at present President of the Greater Hartford Community Council. He is a member of the Board of Directors of Union Settlement, Hartford, and of the Connecticut Mental Hygiene Society. He is Lecturer in Psychology in the Hartt School of Music, and for the last twelve years has exerted much influence throughout the Hartford community as a regular columnist for the *Hartford Times*.

Dean Wells brings to his new responsibilities sound judgment, ripe experience, and the affection and respect of all his colleagues in the Foundation faculties, as well as of the student body past and present.

THE PRESIDENT'S ENGAGEMENTS

Since coming to the Foundation on November 1, 1945, President Stafford has combined with his duties on the campus and in the Hartford area a considerable number of journeys and addresses in the interest of the Foundation and of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, of which he is also President.

He has preached in Boston and New York, New Haven, Providence, Auburn (Maine), White Plains (New York), Bridgeport, and New London, and at Mt. Holyoke, Middlebury, Bates, Carleton, Doane, and Macalester Colleges, and the University of Connecticut. He has also visited the Universities of Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Hamline, and Beloit, Albion, and Olivet Colleges. In May he spoke at the Congregational Conferences of Nebraska (at Crete), South Dakota (at Redfield), and Ohio (at Toledo).

On January 14 he addressed the Connecticut Council of Churches, at Middletown, on "The Churches and the Church." On February 25 he lectured before the Boston Congregational Club on "A World Bill of Rights." On May 15 he spoke at the Annual Alumni Dinner of Union Theological Seminary, his subject being, "The Task of the Parish Ministry Today."

After attending the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, at McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago, June 11-12, and the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches, at Grinnell College, June 18-26, he plans to spend two months in Maine, except for Sunday appointments through July in various parts of the East.